REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification and have amended claims 5, 16, and 26. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants hereby request further examination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of claims 5-35.

The Office has objected to the specification asserting that trademarks are not properly identified as trademark/trade names and should be capitalized wherever they appear. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification as noted above to capitalize each occurrence a trade name and trademark. Applicants believe the generic terminology already accompanies each of these trade names and trademarks. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the specification.

The Office has rejected claims 5-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,462 to Freeman et al. ("Freeman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,687 to Greaves et al. ("Greaves"). In particular, the Office asserts that Freeman discloses a client communication system that receives control data from at least one of the plurality of clients, the control data associated with tasks to be performed for a training exercise at col. 2, line 63 through col. 3, line 3; a device management system that provides low-level commands for the electronic training devices based on the control data from the at least one client to implement functions to change a configuration of the electronic devices at col. 5, lines 42-61; col. 6, lines 25-34; and col. 9, lines 19-24; and a control system configured to access a first set of two or more of the electronic training devices based upon one or more requirements of the training exercise, the control system manipulating the first set of the electronic training devices according to the control data using the low-level commands provided by the device management system to perform portions of the training exercise at col. 5, lines 42-61 and col. 6, lines 25-34. The Office asserts that Freeman does not disclose that the changed configuration results in manipulating fundamental operations of the electronic training devices that the electronic training devices are originally configured to perform, but asserts that Greaves discloses wherein the changed configuration results in manipulating fundamental operations of the electronic training devices that the electronic

training devices are originally configured to perform at col. 2, lines 15-35 and col. 3, lines 22-35.

Neither Freeman nor Greaves, alone or in combination, suggest or disclose "a mentor system that monitors the control data from the client, wherein the mentor system can control the control data from the at least one client" as recited in claim 5 or "monitoring the control data from the at least one client with a mentor system, wherein the mentor system can control the control data from the at least one client" as recited in claims 16 and 26.

Applicants respectfully direct the Office's attention to FIG. 2 and col. 2, lines 55-62 in Freeman which disclose that the client computers 201-207 can communicate with the host 250 to obtain data stored at the host 250 on servers 241-244, but nowhere does Freeman disclose or suggest a mentor system that monitors and can control the control data from the host 250 for a task to be performed by one of the client computers. Similarly, the Office's attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-4 in Greaves which illustrate that a master node device 12, such as a computer on a school teacher's desk, can communicate with a number of slave nodes 14, such as laptop computers supplied to student, but Greaves does not disclose or suggest a mentor system that monitors and can control the control data from the master slave node 12 for a task to be performed by one of the slave nodes 14. The master node device 13 in Greaves provides an assignment of slave nodes 14 to each master node 12, but does not monitor and control the control data from the master slave node 12 for a task to be performed by one of the slave nodes 14. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 16, and 26. Since claims 6-15 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 5, claims 17-25 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 16, and claims 27-35 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 26, they are distinguishable over the cited reference and are patentable in the same manner as claims 5, 16, and 26.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is submitted that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept. 17, 2004

Gunnar G. Leinberg
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

Certificate of Mailing - 37 CFR 1.8(a)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below.	
Sept. 17, 2004	Ruth R. Smith
Date	Ruth R. Smith